

I thank the Senate for its swift passage of this resolution.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution and preamble be agreed to en bloc and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table without intervening action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VOINOVICH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 23) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 23

Whereas Michael Jeffrey Jordan has announced his retirement from basketball after 13 seasons with the Chicago Bulls;

Whereas Michael Jordan helped make the long, hard winters bearable for millions of Chicagoans by leading the Chicago Bulls to 6 National Basketball Association Championships during the past 8 years, earning 5 NBA Most Valuable Player awards, and winning 10 NBA scoring titles;

Whereas Michael Jordan and his Olympic teammates thrilled basketball fans around the world by winning gold medals at the 1984 and 1992 Olympic Games;

Whereas Michael Jordan has demonstrated an unsurpassed level of professionalism during his athletic career and has served as a role model to millions of American children by demonstrating the qualities that mark a true champion: hard work, grace, determination, and commitment to excellence;

Whereas Michael Jordan taught us to have the courage to follow our dreams by striving to play baseball for the Chicago White Sox;

Whereas Michael Jordan demonstrated the importance of pursuing an education by earning a bachelor of arts degree from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill;

Whereas Michael Jordan continues to contribute to our communities through his support for the James R. Jordan Boys & Girls Club and Family Life Center in Chicago, the Jordan Institute for Families at his alma mater, and the Ronald McDonald Houses of Greenville, Chapel Hill, Durham, and Winston-Salem, North Carolina, for families of seriously ill children who are being treated at nearby hospitals; and

Whereas Michael Jordan will take on new challenges in his life with the same passion and determination that made him the greatest basketball player ever to have lived: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates Michael Jordan on his retirement from the Chicago Bulls and professional basketball; and

(2) expresses its wishes that Michael Jordan enjoy his life after basketball with his wife, Juanita, and their 3 children, Jeffrey, Marcus, and Jasmine.

THE PRESIDENT'S STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me speak briefly, because I see the Senators from Iowa and Minnesota are here. Let me say, about the President's State of the Union Address last night, we are very proud of the fact that the Democratic leadership in the House and the Senate offered a battery of legislation supporting the President's goals. I was heartened by the fact that the President lifted our eyes from the drudgery of our Senate trial and spoke

again to the many issues which really have brought us to Congress in an effort to try to improve the lives of Americans and American families.

The President has taken a fiscally responsible approach by suggesting, for example, that as we stabilize Social Security we do not run up greater deficits. He is pledging a percentage of the future surpluses to stabilize and protect Social Security. That is a responsible approach and one which future generations will certainly applaud. He has made a similar commitment to the Medicare system, saying that some 15 or 16 percent of the surplus will be dedicated to make certain that it is solvent through the year 2020.

I was heartened by two other things that the President suggested. At the turn of this century, as we embarked upon the 20th century, America distinguished itself and the world as a nation dedicated to public education. We became a nation of high school students, and during a span of some 20 years on average a new high school was built once every day in America. We democratized education, we created opportunity, and we created the American century.

Will we do it again for the 21st century? President Clinton challenged us last night as a Congress to come together, Republicans and Democrats, dedicated to public education. I think we could and should do that. I am happy that he has shown leadership again in this important field.

And finally, and this is on a personal note, for more than 10 years in Congress I have joined with many of my colleagues, including the Senator from Iowa, Senator HARKIN, and Senator WELLSTONE from Minnesota, Senator LAUTENBERG from New Jersey, and so many others in our battle against the tobacco industry. We believe it is nothing short of disgraceful that we continue to have more and more of our adolescents in America addicted to this deadly product. The Senate dropped the ball last year. We had a chance to pass meaningful legislation to protect our kids, but a partisan minority stopped the debate. The tobacco lobby won.

Now I hope that we can reverse that on the floor of the Senate and the floor of the House of Representatives. But if we cannot, President Clinton said last night we will join, as some 42 other States have, in court, suing the tobacco companies as a Federal Government for the costs that American taxpayers have incurred because of their deadly product.

I salute the President for doing that. I applaud him for his leadership, again, in this field of issues that is fraught with political danger. I believe that his speech last night gave us some hope that we can move forward, even if Congress fails to do the right thing and protect our children.

We stand at an important crossroads. There is no inherent reason why the change in calendar from 1999 to 2000

should matter. Some say it is just another year. But we humans find significance in that event, and the question is whether the 106th Congress, which will bridge the centuries, will be a Congress that will be remembered as a productive Congress that came together on a bipartisan basis to help Americans, not only today, but in generations to come.

We have to continue to ask ourselves why we are here, how we can make America a better place, and the President's State of the Union Address gave us the direction.

I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

OPEN SENATE DELIBERATIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I take the floor today with my colleague and friend from Minnesota, Senator WELLSTONE, to speak about an issue that is going to be coming up here in the next several days that is going to have an importance to all of the American people and, indeed, to future generations. That is the issue of whether or not the Senate, in its deliberations on the impeachment of President Clinton, will do it in secret or will do it in public; will do it behind closed doors, behind a curtain of secrecy, or do it openly so that the American people know what we are doing. I want to take just a few minutes to lay out the case for why I believe it should be open.

Last week, Mr. President, I raised an objection during the trial to the continued use of the word "jurors," as it pertains to Senators sitting in a Court of Impeachment. I did that for a number of reasons, because we are not jurors. We are more than that. We are not just simply triers of fact. We are not just simply finders of law. But sitting as a Court of Impeachment, we have a broad mandate, an expansive role to play. We have to take everything into account, everything from facts—yes, we have to take facts into account—we have to take law into account, but we also have to take into account a broad variety of things: how the case got here; what it is about; how important it is; how important is this piece of evidence weighed against that; what is the public will; how do the people feel about this; what will happen to the public good if one course of action is taken over another. These are all things we have to weigh, and that is why I felt strongly that Senators, in our own minds and in the public minds, should not be put in the box of simply being a juror.

One other aspect of that is if, in fact, we are jurors, the argument went, then juries deliberate in secret and, therefore, if we are a jury, we should deliberate in secret. Now that we know we are not jurors, I believe that argument has gone away. I believe that we are, in fact, mandated by the Constitution to be more than that.

I quote from an article that appeared in the Chicago Tribune by Professor